

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-37 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 9, 11-14, 16, 17, 21-26, 28-30, 32 and 34-36 have been amended herewith. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-9, 12-26, 28-32 and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Grewal et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,691,159 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention is directed to an improved technique for facilitating co-action/communication between a user requesting assistance from an expert, and in particular for aiding a user in searching for subject area information on a data processing system. In response to a request for an interactive expertise session, two items are provided to facilitate the improved co-action/communication that is provided by the present invention – (1) an electronic page display and (2) a communication interface. In addition, interactive expertise is presented. A first portion of the interactive display, such as the communication between a requester of the interactive expertise and the supplier of the interactive expertise, is presented upon the communication interface. In addition, a second portion of the interactive display, such as contents of an information page related to the subject area as determined by the supplier, is presented upon the electronic page display. This is shown in the preferred embodiment at Applicants' FIG. 9, elements 902 and 904. The presentation of both requested information and a communication with the supplier of the interactive expertise greatly facilitates co-action/communication between a user requesting assistance and an expert providing such assistance.

In contrast, per the teachings of the cited Grewal reference (and as can specifically be seen by Grewal's FIG. 6), only a chat feature is provided between a user and one or more experts using a chat room user interface. There is no ability to also provide in a second area the results of an expertise's assistance such as a resulting information page.

In particular with respect to Claim 1, such claim recites "presenting interactive expertise related to the subject area, wherein a first portion of the interactive expertise is

presented upon the communication interface and a second portion of the interactive expertise is presented upon the electronic page display, wherein the first portion of the interactive expertise presented upon the communication interface comprises a communication between a requestor of the interactive expertise and a supplier of the interactive expertise and the second portion of the interactive expertise presented upon the electronic page display comprises at least one information page related to the subject area as determined by the supplier". As can be seen by FIG. 6 of the cited Grewal reference, while a web page is displayed in addition to a chat window, *this web page is not the result of any expert's determination as to information relating the requested subject area*, but rather is merely a web page that provides a chat room interface for displaying one or more chat windows (Grewal Col. 4, lines 18-33). Claim 1 expressly recites that the second portion of the interactive expertise presented upon the electronic page display *comprises at least one information page related to the subject area as determined by the supplier*. This claimed feature of a second portion of the interactive expertise presented upon the electronic page display *is in addition* to the claimed feature of a first portion of the interactive expertise presented upon the communication interface that comprises a communication between a requestor of the interactive expertise and a supplier of the interactive expertise – which is alleged to be taught by the Instant Messaging/Chat for communicating between the users and experts. Thus, it is shown that amended Claim 1 (and dependent Claims 2-16) is not anticipated by the cited reference.

In rejecting the claimed feature of a second portion of the interactive expertise presented upon the electronic page display that comprises at least one information page related to the subject area as determined by the supplier, the Examiner states:

"the help topic posted on the panel of experts will be analyzed and matched with expertise related to the topic, so there is only related information between the users and experts will be exchanged and displayed on the communication display, e.g. col. 3 line 53 – col. 4 line 33, and figs. 5-7"

In response thereto, Applicants urge that Claim 1 goes beyond such generalized assertion. In particular, Claim 1 recites providing both an electronic page display and a communication on a graphical user interface. A first portion of interactive expertise is

presented upon the communication, where this first portion comprises a communication between the requestor and supplier of the interactive expertise. This is alleged by the Examiner to be the chat session, such as is shown in block 212 of Figure 6. However, and in addition, Claim 1 also recites a second portion of the interactive expertise is presented upon the electronic page display of the graphical user interface, where the second portion comprises at least one information page related to the subject area as determined by the supplier. The cited reference does not provide this second portion of interactive expertise that is supplier determined. The only supplier information depicted by Grewal is that chat session itself, where a textual dialogue box 212 for a given expert is used to show textual interchange between such expert and the user (Grewal col. 4, lines 24-27). While it is possible to engage other experts using other textual dialogue boxes 212, these other textual dialogue boxes do not teach that a first portion of the interactive expertise presented upon the communication interface comprises a *communication between a requestor of the interactive expertise and a supplier of the interactive expertise* and the second portion of the interactive expertise presented upon the electronic page display comprises *at least one information page related to the subject area as determined by the supplier*".

Claim 1 expressly recites both a requester/supplier communication presented upon a communication interface AND an information page as determined by the supplier that is presented upon an electronic page display. A general allegation that the cited reference teaches that only related information between users and experts will be exchanged and displayed on a display does not establish a teaching of the two specific items that are presented per Claim 1. For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. 102, *every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown* in a single reference. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis added by Applicants). As shown above, every element of the claimed invention is not identically shown in the cited Grewal reference, and thus it is shown that Grewal does not anticipate Claim 1.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of dependent Claims 2-9 and 12-16 for reasons given above regarding Claim 1, of which Claims 2-9 and 12-16 ultimately depend upon.

Further with respect to Claim 2 (and dependent Claim 15), Applicants show that such claim recites that the at least one information page is *also presented to the supplier* of the interactive expertise. This is shown in the preferred embodiment at Applicants' FIG 10, at element 1006 within client browser 1008 and element 1006 within expert browser 1010, and further facilitates co-action/communication by the requester and supplier by allowing both to simultaneously view search results. The cited reference does not teach this claimed feature or its resulting advantage. Rather, the cited reference only shows a single presentation to the *requester* of the information and provides no information or other teaching as to what may or may not be presented to the *supplier* of the information.

Further with respect to Claim 8, such claim recites the feature of wherein the communication interface AND the electronic page display are provided on (1) a graphical user interface of the requester AND (2) a graphical user interface of the supplier". The cited reference only shows a single presentation to the *requester* and provides no information or other teaching as to what may or may not be presented to the *supplier* of the information, and in particular does not teach providing both a communication interface AND an electronic page display to the supplier's graphical user interface. Thus, Claim 8 is further shown to not be anticipated by the cited reference.

Further with respect to Claim 15, which depends upon Claim 2, such claim further emphasizes the advantages provided by the dual display of the information page to both the requester and supplier, in that either the requester or supplier can manipulate such page (such as selecting an item or URL to retrieve further information) to further provide cooperative interaction between the requester and supplier (Specification page 18, lines 3-11; page 23, lines 6-30). The cited reference does not teach this claimed feature or its resulting advantage.

With respect to Claim 17 (and dependent Claims 18-21), such claim recites "responsive to receiving the first electronic page, simultaneously displaying the first electronic page and a communication interface" and "transmitting generated interactive expertise based on the subject area, wherein the generated interactive expertise utilizes both the first electronic page and the communication interface". The cited reference does not teach these claimed features. In rejecting Claim 17, the Examiner relies on reasoning

given in rejecting Claim 1 as they are similar in scope. Applicants show error, in that Claim 17 recites a simultaneous display of both the first electronic page (having content associated with the requested subject area) and a communication interface, such simultaneous display *being responsive to receiving the first electronic page which was selected responsive to receiving a request for an interactive expertise session*. There is no such teaching in the cited reference, which instead merely teaches display of an interactive chat session. The simultaneous display of both the electronic page and the communication interface, responsive to receiving the first electronic page which was selected responsive to receiving a request for an interactive expertise session, further facilitates cooperative interaction as both the requested information and the interactive session with the expert are both simultaneously displayed responsive to receiving the first electronic page which was selected responsive to receiving a request for an interactive expertise session. As every feature of Claim 17 (and dependent Claims 18-21) is not identically shown in a single reference, it is shown that Claim 17 (and dependent Claims 18-21) has been erroneously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Further with respect to Claim 21, such claim recites selection of a second electronic page, replacing the first page with the second page, and the simultaneous display of this second, selected web page and the communication interface *on both a client machine and an expert machine*. The cited reference does not teach such simultaneous display of both a selected web page, selected from a web page having content associated with the selected subject area, and a communication interface on two different machines, but rather merely teaches single display of a chat room user interface with one or more chat windows (Grewal Col. 4, lines 18-34). Thus, Claim 21 is further shown to not be anticipated by the cited reference.

Further with respect to Claim 22, such claim has been amended to recite the claimed feature of "wherein the generated interactive expertise is transmitted to the client machine and is displayed on both the client machine and an expert machine". This claimed feature advantageously provides for display of the generated interactive expertise on both the client machine and expert machine to further facilitate the cooperative interaction abilities provided by the present invention. The cited reference does not teach

this claimed feature or its resulting advantages. Thus, Claim 22 is further shown to not be anticipated by the cited reference.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claim 23 for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 1.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claim 24 (and dependent Claim 25) for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 17.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claim 25 for the further reasons given above regarding Claim 22.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claim 26 (and dependent Claims 27 and 28) for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 1.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claim 29 (and dependent Claim 30) for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 17.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claim 30 for the further reasons given above regarding Claim 21.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claim 31 for the further reasons given above regarding Claims 15 and 22.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claim 32 (and dependent Claim 34) for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 1.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claim 35 (and dependent Claims 36 and 37) for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 17.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claim 36 for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 21.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of Claim 37 for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 15 and 22.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-9, 12-26, 28-32 and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

## **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness**

The Examiner rejected Claims 10-11, 27 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Grewal et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,691,159 B1) in view of Crosskey et. al (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,281). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 10-11, 27 and 33 for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 1. To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP 2143.03. *See also, In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). All of the claim limitations pertaining to the first portion and second portion are not taught or suggested by the cited references, and thus a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established with respect to Claim 10 (and dependent Claim 11).

Further with respect to Claim 10 (and dependent Claim 11), Applicants show that none of the cited references teach or suggest the claimed feature of "upon termination of the interactive expertise session, calculating a charge for the interactive expertise session". As can be seen, this claim recites a charge calculation *upon termination of the interactive expertise session*. In rejecting Claim 10, the Examiner cites Crosskey as showing that Web pages can be used 'to display billing responsibility of the users for accessing the Web' and 'computing the billing amount of each data transfer associated with the Web pages'. Applicants urge that even assuming arguendo that Crosskey teaches a step of displaying billing responsibility and another subsequent step of computing a billing, such assumption still does not establish a teaching or suggestion of displaying a charge that is calculated upon termination of the interactive session. Rather, Crosskey teaches display of billing responsibility *prior to* content access, such that the user can determine which content they want to access (Col. 2, lines 62-64). While subsequent billing may be calculated, there is no teaching or suggestion that such subsequent billing calculation is in any way displayed to the requestor of the session upon termination of the session, as expressly recited in Claim 1. Rather, Crosskey teaches display of billing responsibility *before* content is accessed, to assist the requestor in determining whether or not to access the content. Such *before-the-fact* display of billing responsibility does not teach or suggest an *after-the-fact* display of actual billing charges for the session *upon termination of the session*. Since all of the claim limitations are not taught or suggested by the cited references, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established with respect to Claim 10 (and dependent Claim 11).

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 27 and 33 for similar reasons to those given above regarding Claim 10.

**III. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited reference and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE:

12/30/04

Respectfully submitted,



Duke W. Yee  
Reg. No. 34,285  
Wayne P. Bailey  
Reg. No. 34,289  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorneys for Applicants